

5

REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 2, 2005 with claims 1 through 26. Claims 1 through 26 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-3, 12, 15-18, and 26 are proposed to be amended herein.

10 In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens (United States Patent Number 6,404,880).

Independent Claims 1, 17 and 26

Independent claims 1, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens. Regarding claims 1, 17, and 26, the Examiner asserts that Stevens teaches generating a notification message (col. 3, lines 12-36).

15 Applicants note that Stevens is directed to “providing subscriber alerts that warn the subscriber to severe weather and traffic conditions.” Stevens also teaches that “the subscriber may receive wakeup and reminder calls.” (See, Abstract.) Assuming solely for the sake of argument that the wakeup and reminder calls are triggered by employing a “caller ID” type function to obtain the telephone number of the calling party, the wakeup and reminder calls are placed back to the same
20 original calling party.

The present invention, on the other hand, initially determines an originating endpoint address on a network associated with a received communication, in a similar manner to a caller ID function in a telephone domain. The obtained originating endpoint address associated with the communication is then used to identify one or more previously designated *third* persons to receive a
25 notification message. It is noted that a third person is any person other than the calling party.

Thus, Stevens does not disclose or suggest identifying one or more designated third persons associated with the originating endpoint address associated with the (received) communication; or sending a notification message to the one or more designated third persons, as required by each independent claim, as amended.

30 Dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-25

Dependent claims 2-16 and 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens.

Claims 2-16 and 18-25 are dependent on claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Stevens because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1,

5 17, and 26 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

10 The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 3, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560